A HISTORY OF THE NEW PHILOLOGY AND THE NEW PHILOLOGY IN HISTORY

Matthew Restall
Pennsylvania State University

Our field [the social history of colonial Latin America] seems to have arrived at a stage where the most important tasks . . . all demand neither detail-shy theoreticians nor purely document-oriented investigators, but flexible minds who can see the general within the particular. (Lockhart 1972, 36)

Of all the rich fields of study that the history of Mexico offers, none have superseded colonial ethnohistory over the long term in the steady distinction of its scholarship. (Kicza 1995, 240)

The [New Philology] has opened the interior of colonial indigenous society in ways fundamental to any understanding of culture, while it lays reasonable claim to being the most innovative and recognizable 'school' of colonial history to yet emerge. (Van Young 1999, 234)

It has often been suggested that there are two reasons for the particular vitality of the ethnohistory of colonial Mesoamerica.[1] John Kicza eloquently articulated these reasons not long ago (1995, 240) as first, the "integrity" and "vigor" of native civilizations from pre-Conquest to modern times, and secondly, the richness and variety of relevant colonial documentation. Without taking issue with this rationale at all—indeed, working from the assumption that we may take for granted these two factors—I would like to suggest that a third factor is equally pertinent; to wit, the concatenation of activity by a wide variety of scholars

1. By "ethnohistory" I mean the study of the history of native or indigenous peoples. I use "Mesoamerica" rather than "Mexico" because although the field is usually confined to Mexico, and therefore most of the discussion that follows relates to studies of regions within modern Mexico's borders, the loosely defined area of Mesoamerica is more meaningful to the colonial native experience and its study. A briefer version of this article appeared as "Filología y etnohistoria: Una breve historia de la 'nueva filología' en Norteamérica," *Desacatos* 7 (Fall 2001, 85–102). I am grateful to Frances Karttunen, Susan Kellogg, Kris Lane, Erick Langer, Susan Schroeder, and David Tavarez for commenting on that earlier version, and to the three anonymous readers for *LARR*, whom I hope will see the influence of their invaluable suggestions.

Latin American Research Review, Vol. 38, No. 1, February 2003
© 2003 by the University of Texas Press, P.O. Box 7819, Austin, TX 78713-7819

https://doi.org/10.1353/lar.2003.0012 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in such a way as to create a collective vision of method and interpretation and a constructive momentum that realizes and further develops that vision.

I am referring, of course, to a school of thought or study, specifically, the school increasingly known as the New Philology, a school within (not synonymous with) the ethnohistory of colonial Mesoamerica. The purpose of this article, then, is to offer an historiographical survey of this school—its history and development, its location within the contexts of colonial Latin American history and Mesoamerican ethnohistory, its strengths and weaknesses, and its apparent current trajectory, ongoing significance, and future prospects. For reasons of space, my focus will be on English-language publications, but readers should be aware that there is an important parallel body of scholarship in Spanish, most of it published in Mexico.

As this entire essay is an extended definition of the school, let me first offer a brief definitional outline. Simply put, the New Philology includes those students of the ethnohistory of colonial Mesoamerica whose scholarship is based on native-language sources (the vast majority hitherto unstudied), who emphasize a broadly philological (i.e., historical-linguistic) analysis of those sources, and who subscribe to the view that the study of native-language sources is crucial to understanding indigenous societies. The school is thus both a model and a method, with the "New" referring to the innovation both of emphasizing native roles in colonial history through the study of native-language sources (the model) and of analyzing those sources philologically (the method). I shall argue later in this essay, however, that the New Philology's future may lie in privileging the philological method over the model of exclusively studying native societies using native sources.

The New Philology is most closely associated with James Lockhart and indeed has also been called the Lockhart School; however, it extends beyond Lockhart and his students to include a growing number of scholars in the United States, Canada, and Mexico (and, to a lesser extent, Guatemala and Europe) not directly linked to him. As already mentioned, this essay would be impossibly long were it to include Spanish-language scholarship, but an extended version would include discussion of work by Ramón Arzápalo, Alfredo Barrera Vásquez, Una Canger (mentioned below in the context of her English-language publications), Pedro Carrasco, Miguel León-Portilla (one of a trio of scholars who made crucial pre–1976 contributions in Spanish, as mentioned below), Alfredo López Austin, Tsubasa Okoshi Harada, and Luis Reyes García (an extended version of this essay would also include publications in German by Hanns Prem, Günter Zimmerman and others).

The school began in the study of Nahuatl sources and thus far had made its greatest detailed contributions to the study of the Nahuas of

https://doi.org/10.1353/lar.2003.0012 Published online by Cambridge University Press

central Mexico, but in recent years it has grown significantly beyond *nahuatlato* studies (a *nahuatlato* is someone proficient in Nahuatl). Its two great contributions, not just to Mesoamerican ethnohistory but to colonial Latin American history, are the placing of native-language sources at the center of ethnohistorical study and the reorientation of colonial history around indigenous perspectives, thereby demarginalizing native peoples. The New Philology has produced social and cultural history more than other kinds of historical literature, such as economic (although see my questioning of this distinction below). The school developed at the fruitful intersection of history and anthropology, being rooted in and nurtured by both disciplines, although in terms of its methodologies and the training of its members, the New Philology is located primarily in history, with anthropology a close second, and other disciplines—most notably linguistics, literature, and art history—also involved. In the recent words of Lockhart, the New Philology is history simply "because history is the broadest and most flexible of the 'disciplines'" (2000, 367).

I propose to view the history of the New Philology as consisting of three phases. The following three sections of this essay each correspond to one of these phases; my discussion of the third phase includes the analytical core of the article, where I advance my argument for the broader location, current relevance, and future significance of the school.

PHASE ONE (1976–92)

The first phase of the New Philology began in 1976. Prior to this date (and going back over a century, almost to the point when the New Philology's primary sources stopped being written), colonial-era native-language sources in Nahuatl, several Mayan languages, and a number of other Mesoamerican tongues had been located in archives, collected, published in translation, and even subjected to some analysis. But the sum of this work had not amounted to any kind of coherent interpretation of colonial Mesoamerican societies, nor had it influenced in any major way the historiographical development of the study of native peoples in Mexico and Guatemala. Indeed, such work was often seen as marginal or was marginalized by the scholarly mainstream; early pioneers such as Daniel Brinton and Ralph Roys operated in part outside of the academy, while Mexican giants such as Angel María Garibay, Fernando Horcasitas, and León-Portilla could not impact English-speaking academia as they might have done had they taught at institutions in the United States or Britain.

This is not to denigrate this earlier scholarship; it seeded and nurtured the roots from which the New Philology grew, and much of it remains relevant and significant. Yet in retrospect, 1976 can be seen as

https://doi.org/10.1353/lar.2003.0012 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the school's foundational moment, as the initiation of a kind of ethnohistory whose vision—and, it must be said, timing—would not only propel the study of native sources out of the margins but would redefine the mainstream of the field itself.

This moment was marked by the publication of two ground-breaking presentations of colonial Nahuatl sources. *Beyond the Codices,* credited to Arthur Anderson, Frances Berdan, and Lockhart, offered a selection of mundane, notarial sources translated from Nahuatl with extensive analysis dispersed through introductory and annotated material. The volume suggested that seemingly superficial and hitherto-dismissed documents, such as testaments and land records written by native notaries, were potentially rich sources of historical information. The same year Frances Karttunen and Lockhart published *Nahuatl in the Middle Years: Language Contact Phenomena in Texts of the Colonial Period,* which showed in detail how analyzing the language of such sources could reveal patterns of cultural contact and development that had never before been visible. (For his account of how he came to produce these collaborative works, see Lockhart 2000, 350–56.) Together, the two volumes were an academic call to arms.

This call to arms was heeded during the succeeding decade and a half, with a flurry of doctoral dissertations, then of monographs, and all the while an increasing number of compilations of native-language sources, as well as conference papers, essays, and articles. Much of this work was done by students of Lockhart at the University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA), who between 1983 and 1989 completed a series of dissertations based on Nahuatl-language sources from specific communities or regions within central Mexico. I shall briefly discuss these in chronological order (note that Lockhart 1991b summarizes them in more detail), before turning to the work of Lockhart himself, and then to that of other scholars who did not study at UCLA but who helped to create the first phase of the New Philology.

The first of the above-mentioned dissertations was by S. L. Cline, finished in 1983 and published in 1986 as *Colonial Culhuacan, 1580–1600: A Social History of an Aztec Town.* It articulated in detail the potential suggested in *Beyond the Codices* for testaments to cast bright light on social life in the Nahua municipal community or *altepetl.* In a move that has become a hallmark of the New Philology, the study's sources were also published in transcription and translation (as Cline and León-Portilla 1984; in 1993 Cline also published a volume of Nahuatl sources unrelated to her monograph), with the inclusion of both being highly indicative of the school's philosophy of scholarly contribution.

The second and third of these dissertations came in 1984. Susan Schroeder's doctoral work, published in 1991 as *Chimalpahin and the Kingdoms of Chalco,* differed from the other dissertations in this category in

https://doi.org/10.1353/lar.2003.0012 Published online by Cambridge University Press

that it was more an intellectual history of a seventeenth-century Nahua scholar than a social history of an *altepetl,* although central to its great contribution to the field was its success as both of these things. In true New Philology fashion, Schroeder also initiated an ambitious six-volume publication of newly discovered Chimalpahin writings (the first two of which are listed below as Anderson and Schroeder 1997). Meanwhile, Stephanie Wood's dissertation, as yet unpublished, was also completed in 1984. Its study of colonial Nahua communities in the Toluca region greatly altered our understanding of the *altepetl* in general and specifically its corporate integrity and sustaining ideology. While all the studies of this first phase were inevitably accompanied by various articles that I have not listed here, it is worth noting that Stephanie Wood has been particularly prolific in this regard, with the collective contribution of her articles to a large extent compensating for the lack of a monograph. One such article is in the *Indian Women of Early Mexico* volume, which was published in 1997 but was conceived in the phase-one years (edited by three former Lockhart students from the period, including Wood; nine of its fifteen contributors are former collaborators or students of Lockhart, and most of its chapters are New Philological).

The fourth and fifth Lockhart-supervised dissertations of this first phase have both been published, although in revised form, with important new material added but also with relevant material taken out. As a result, the dissertations themselves remain significant works. Robert Haskett's, finished in 1985 (and published in 1991 as *Indigenous Rulers: An Ethnohistory of Town Government in Colonial Cuernavaca*), offered new insights into municipal government in the Cuernavaca area and, by extension, the broader political culture of the *altepetl.* Not only did Haskett use Nahuatl sources hitherto unworked, as indeed did all these early New Philology scholars, but he even discovered an entire genre of document, that of *altepetl* election records (a genre whose cognate also turned up in Yucatan). His work has become an obligatory reference point for any student of local government in colonial Mesoamerica.

In combination, the dissertations of Cline, Schroeder, Wood, and Haskett revealed the various ways in which the *altepetl* persisted as the locus of a complex combination of cultural continuity and adaptation to colonial circumstances; these studies and those that followed not only brought a multi-dimensionality to native society, but challenged scholars to rethink their assumptions about how colonial rule was even possible.

What Haskett did for government, Rebecca Horn did for land. Her 1989 dissertation, partially published in 1997's *Postconquest Coyoacan: Nahua-Spanish Relations in Central Mexico, 1519–1650,* analyzed a vast corpus of land transactions and other Nahuatl documents from Coyoacan to produce a unique portrait of Nahua land culture; in doing so, she also illuminated various related aspects of native social, political, and economic life.

https://doi.org/10.1353/lar.2003.0012 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In the 1980s Lockhart himself also published a series of brief studies that answered his own philological call to arms of 1976 (many of them most easily accessed in 1991's *Nahuas and Spaniards* collection). In retrospect, these articles and essays, along with the five dissertations discussed above, were previews of portions of the magnum opus that was to appear in 1992 as *The Nahuas After the Conquest.* The culmination and climax to the first phase of the New Philology, *The Nahuas* offered detailed and lucid analysis of almost every imaginable aspect of life in the *altepetl* from the mid-sixteenth to mid-eighteenth centuries. Yet while it lit up a myriad of smaller pictures, the book also revealed for the first time the larger picture of colonial Nahua culture and society. In a sense, in non-native eyes, the natives of central Mexico had for almost five centuries been Indians. Lockhart's monograph made them Nahuas again.

The *Nahuas After the Conquest* should properly be seen as the great hub to a wagon wheel whose spokes and rim consist of ancillary works published by Lockhart in the 1980s and 1990s. (Thus although some of these came out after 1992, which I have designated the terminal year of the school's first phase, they should be seen as part of that phase.) These were primarily (in true New Philology form) publications of Nahuatl sources in transcription and English translation, although typically with sufficient introduction and commentary to be virtually monographic on their own—and even more so when viewed properly as appendices to *The Nahuas.* Among such publications are 1986's *The Tlaxcalan Actas* (with Frances Berdan and Arthur Anderson); 1987's *The Art of Nahuatl Speech: The Bancroft Dialogues* (with Frances Karttunen; notable for its *two* English translations, one literal, one idiomatic); 1993's *We People Here: Nahuatl Accounts of the Conquest of Mexico,* which finally offered such accounts in both the original Nahuatl and in translation, as well as in discrete texts rather than in composite form; and 1998's *The Story of Guadalupe* (with Lisa Sousa and Stafford Poole), a definitive study and edition in Nahuatl and English of the original 1649 Laso de la Vega manuscript. A volume of collected essays and articles, similar in nature to *Nahuas and Spaniards,* was also published as *Of Things of the Indies* (2000), and a full-length guide to learning *Nahuatl as Written* came out in 2001, along with the first English edition of Carochi's 1645 *Arte de la lengua mexicana* (a project Lockhart began at the inception of the New Philology in the late 1970s).

As substantial and influential as all this scholarship is, the first phase of the New Philology should not be taken as the achievement solely of Lockhart and those who studied with him. A number of other scholars also made crucial contributions during this period (1976–92); the fact that most of them can also be seen as part of other historiographical trends does not make them any less New Philologists, but rather reflects the way in which the school has been connected to, and influenced, larger trends right from the start.

https://doi.org/10.1353/lar.2003.0012 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Among these scholars are four to whom I should like to draw particular attention. The first is Karttunen, linguist and historian, periodic collaborator with Lockhart (on the foundational *Nahuatl in the Middle Years*, for example), but above all author in her own right of several highly influential linguistic and ethnohistorical studies, most notably a trio of early-1980s publications—a 1982 article on "Nahuatl Literacy," 1983's *Analytical Dictionary of Nahuatl* (a companion to her and R. Joe Campbell's *Foundation Course in Nahuatl Grammar*), and 1985's *Nahuatl and Maya in Contact with Spanish* (whose role in the development of the school's second phase is cited below).

The second is anthropologist Louise Burkhart, who revolutionized the study of religion in sixteenth-century Mexico, and helped make a reappraisal of the spiritual conquest central to the New Philology's achievements. Her doctoral dissertation was revised and published in 1989 as *The Slippery Earth*, to which was added 1996's *Holy Wednesday*, 2001's *Before Guadalupe*, and a dozen related studies, ranging from journal articles (e.g., 1995) to textbook essays (e.g., 1996b).

Third is Frances Berdan, who in addition to collaborating with Anderson and Lockhart on two important phase-one volumes mentioned above (*Beyond the Codices* and *The Tlaxcalan Actas*), has also been wholly or partially responsible for half a dozen additional books, primarily on Nahua history. Most notable among them is the 1992 multi-volume study of the Codex Mendoza (edited with Patricia Anawalt), which gives that manuscript a thorough New Philology-style presentation and analysis.

Fourth and last, but by no means least, is another anthropologist whose historical writing helped forge the New Philology's ties between history and anthropology—Susan Kellogg. Although her monograph, *Law and the Transformation of Aztec Culture*, was not published until 1995, Kellogg produced analyses of Nahuatl sources from Mexico City through the 1980s and early-1990s and should be seen as part of the first phase of the school's development. The significance of her contribution goes beyond the fact the she is a non-Lockhartian New Philologist, a scholar of Nahuatl whose use of judicial records and a social study of the law seem more to represent the legacy of Woodrow Borah than any ethnohistorian. Rather the importance of Kellogg's work, at least with respect to the New Philology, is the fact that she used Nahuatl sources to develop a thesis that is in many ways antithetical to Lockhart's interpretation of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Where Lockhart saw a golden age in the middle years of the colony (e.g., 1992, 433–34), Kellogg saw a decline in Nahua cultural autonomy, with the courts serving as "an instrument of cultural conversion" and a consolidator of "Spanish cultural hegemony" (1995, 214).

In using native-language alphabetic sources as a window into culture loss and change, rather than a litmus of cultural florescence, Kellogg

https://doi.org/10.1353/lar.2003.0012 Published online by Cambridge University Press

showed that Borah was not her only old school influence. For Kellogg's book is not far in its emphases from what I shall dub here the "French school" of interpretation; this school is not limited to French scholars (indeed it has accomplished affiliates in Mexico, such as Enrique Florescano, and in the United States, such as Walter Mignolo), but it is most readily associated with scholars like Claude Lévi-Strauss, Tzvetan Todorov, Christian Duverger, and Serge Gruzinski (and writers like J. M. G. Le Clézio), mostly because their work has been translated into English or Spanish. Although Todorov's *The Conquest of America* and Gruzinski's *Man-Gods in the Mexican Highlands* are probably the best known English-language manifestations of the French school, the only really relevant work here, for its analysis of native-language sources, is Gruzinski's *The Conquest of Mexico* (the 1993 English edition of 1988's *La colonisation de l'imaginaire*).

Nevertheless, even this latter work is only tangentially affiliated with the New Philology, simply because, no less than other French school scholarship, it uses the language of the new culture history—"the colonization of the imaginary"—to advance older notions of culture loss and native annihilation. The current French school scholars have in many ways modernized the paradigm of Spanish-Nahua interaction exemplified by Robert Ricard (what Lockhart has called the "displacement model"; 1992, 2–3); they are, in other words, more fashionably dressed representatives of a "more traditional sort of intellectual history" (to borrow a phrase of Van Young's; 1999, 235). The difference then between Gruzinski and Kellogg is that Kellogg's work succeeds in embracing the spirit of the New Philology even while doubting one of its central tenets (that native-language sources represent cultural vitality), while the French school's working assumption of cultural decay and degenerative compromise runs counter to one of the existential rationales of the New Philology.

Before turning to the second phase of the school, a number of additional first-phase New Philologists deserve mention. The above-cited Anderson began a project with Charles Dibble in 1955 to translate Sahagún's *Florentine Codex*; the result became both central to the roots of the New Philology and to its first phase, during which the project was completed. As befitting the school's emphasis on language, a number of linguistic ethnohistorians in addition to Karttunen have also made important contributions to the school during these years—among them J. Richard Andrews (whose edition with Ross Hassig of Ruiz de Alarcón's *Treatise* is very much in the New Philology vein), William Bright, Una Canger, Joe Campbell, and Mary Clayton. Also in this category is John Bierhorst, whose extensive work with Nahuatl texts (1985a, 1985b, 1992a, 1992b) is noteworthy in part for being a decidedly un-Lockartian contribution to the New Philology (as Lockhart himself has observed; 1991a, 141–57). A pair of ethnohistorians, anthropologists by training, who have

https://doi.org/10.1353/lar.2003.0012 Published online by Cambridge University Press

published in Spanish and English a fair number of articles studying Nahuatl sources are Pedro Carrasco and J. J. Klor de Alva. Finally, two UCLA graduates whose work is relevant but who fit somewhat outside the pattern: Leslie Offutt, whose 1982 dissertation was not a New Philology work (and thus not listed below; a Spanish version was published in 1993 and an English one in 2001), but who did contribute to the school with a 1992 article; and Barry Sell, whose dissertation on ecclesiastical texts in Nahuatl was completed in 1994 but is a *nahuatlato* work belonging in the first phase.

PHASE TWO (1992–98)

As the first phase was reaching its apex in 1992, there emerged a second phase of the New Philology, consisting of the geographical expansion of the principles and methods of the school out of central Mexico and into southern Mesoamerica. As with the first phase, the second can also conveniently be divided into the activities of Lockhart students and of others. Between 1992 and 1998, four UCLA graduates completed doctoral dissertations based on the study and analysis of native-language sources from outside central Mexico.

Kevin Terraciano's study of Mixtec (or Ñudzahui) culture and society used colonial Mixtec sources, both pictorial and alphabetic, to alter in a myriad of ways our perception of native communities in Oaxaca; 1994's "Ñudzahui History: Mixtec Writing and Culture in Colonial Oaxaca" was published as a monograph in 2001 (his 2000 article was a preview). Lisa Sousa's unpublished 1998 dissertation, "Women in Native Societies and Cultures of Colonial Mexico," used sources in Nahuatl and Mixtec to examine the roles and status of native women in the household and community in central and southern Mexico during the first two centuries of colonial rule (also see her article in Schroeder, Wood, and Haskett 1997). Pete Sigal, meanwhile, worked with Yucatec sources to produce a groundbreaking study of colonial Maya culture and sexuality; 1995's "Maya Passions: Colonial Yucatecan Ideas of Gender, Sexuality, and the Body" was reworked and published in 2000 as *From Moon Goddesses to Virgins: The Colonization of Yucatecan Maya Sexual Desire*.

I, too, worked with Maya sources, consciously seeking in my 1992 dissertation to extend the New Philology to Yucatan, thereby also picking up the legacy of an earlier generation of scholars of colonial Maya sources, most notably Ralph Roys. However, like the pre-1976 antecedents to the *nahuatlato* New Philologists, Roys and his contemporaries never produced a coherent, monographic vision or interpretation of native-language sources.

Yucatan was like central Mexico in two other ways. First, the colonial Nahuas were given detailed and skilled attention before the New

https://doi.org/10.1353/lar.2003.0012 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Philology existed in Charles Gibson's 1964 masterpiece, *The Aztecs Under Spanish Rule.* The Yucatec equivalent came two decades later, with Nancy Farriss' *Maya Society Under Colonial Rule.* What both these works had in common was their dependence upon sources in Spanish, enabling the New Philologists working on central Mexico and Yucatan to produce complementary studies confirming some details, disproving others, and generally benefiting from this earlier work through debate with it. Second, just as the scholars of the first phase of the school found a virtually endless supply of colonial Nahuatl sources in archives in Mexico, Spain, and the United States, so have I and others discovered thousands of colonial documents in Yucatec Maya in Mexico, Yucatan, Spain, the United States, and even Britain.

My dissertation, then, was published in 1997 as *The Maya World: Yucatec Culture and Society, 1550–1850,* while a collection of some of its sources, *Life and Death in a Maya Community,* came out in 1995. The 1997 monograph posited that the Maya municipal community, the *cah,* was a complex entity that was central to all aspects of native Yucatec life in colonial times. The similarity of this interpretation to the first-phase New Philologists' view of the *altepetl*—as well as frequent comparative references to the work of the *nahuatlatos* and to Terraciano's work on the Ñudzahui—meant that *The Maya World* could attempt to contribute not only to Yucatec studies but also to a larger understanding of colonial Mesoamerican civilization. Indeed, this larger vision was articulated specifically in an article by Terraciano and myself (in Sousa 1992; the article later revised as Restall 1997b), as well as in a general sense by the contributors to that edited volume (Sousa 1992), among whom were the above-mentioned four UCLA graduates of 1992–98.

In 1998 I also published *Maya Conquistador,* a study and presentation of Maya accounts of the Spanish Conquest. This book has among its intellectual origins four works of particular relevance here. One is a book from the New Philology's pre-1976 roots period, León-Portilla's collection of Nahua accounts of the Conquest published in English as *The Broken Spears* (I even chose the same press for *Maya Conquistador*). Another is a book from the end of the school's first phase, Lockhart's scholarly presentation of the *Broken Spears* sources, his above-mentioned *We People Here;* its emphasis upon multiple Nahua perspectives influenced the thesis of *Maya Conquistador*. The third is Dennis Tedlock's 1985 edition of the *Popol Vuh,* which showed that native texts could be published in accessible translated editions without original-text transcriptions (*contra* New Philology tradition) while still making a New Philology-style contribution through extensive introductory and endnoted discussion of language and related matters.

The fourth influence is Victoria Bricker's brief study of Maya perspectives on colonial and neo-colonial history in 1981's *The Indian Christ,*

https://doi.org/10.1353/lar.2003.0012 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the Indian King—a work which links the New Philology to Tulane, a connection seldom recognized in review essays on Spanish American ethnohistory. For if the New Philology has at its heart a Lockhart school, originally based in UCLA's History Department, then a Tulane school, located in that university's anthropology department, must also be recognized as central to the second phase (albeit a school created as much by serendipitous patterns of faculty hiring than by an agenda of graduate-student supervision).

Although Tulane scholars have produced first-phase work (e.g., Maxwell and Hanson 1993), the anthropology department's important second-phase contribution has been to the study of the colonial Mayas, both in Yucatan and Guatemala. The late Munro Edmonson published editions of two of the Yucatec *Books of Chilam Balam* in 1982 and 1986. In addition to her 1981 book, Bricker published various studies of Maya language and history (see Edmonson and Bricker 1985, for example), and supervised a doctoral dissertation that anticipated the second phase of the New Philology by a decade and a half, Philip Thompson's "Tekanto in the Eighteenth Century" (revised and published in 1999). (Another doctoral graduate of Tulane, John Chuchiak, filed a dissertation in the History department in 2000 on the spiritual conquest in Yucatan, using some sources in Maya.) When Robert Hill joined the anthropology department he brought with him a record of groundbreaking work on the ethnohistory of the Cakchiquel Maya, rendered most accessible in 1992's *Colonial Cakchiquels.* The next decade will no doubt produce new contributions to the New Philology by Bricker, Hill, Maxwell, and others at Tulane.

There is more to the second phase of the school than the two clusters of scholarship just presented, but I shall discuss other contributions in the context of the school's third phase.

PHASE THREE (1990S–THE FUTURE)

The first phase (1976–92) initiated the New Philology as a *nahuatlato* endeavor, producing the first detailed studies of colonial Nahua domestic life, family culture, gender relations, political culture, and land tenure based on native-language sources, while also constructing the foundational ideas and methods of the school; the second (1992–98) extended it to include all of colonial Mesoamerica. The first phase was micro-regional; the second regional and comparative. Combined, the two phases served to move us dramatically closer to understanding native identity and culture, and served to place native peoples at the center of the study of colonial Mexico and Guatemala (thereby contributing to a similar process for the study of all colonial Latin America). The third phase represents the explosion of the school into other disciplines and fields, its crossing of

https://doi.org/10.1353/lar.2003.0012 Published online by Cambridge University Press

boundaries, its absorption into the study of colonial Mesoamerica in ways that make it increasingly hard to identify as a distinct school. In other words, like so many schools and "-isms" before it, the New Philology will soon be too ubiquitous to be noticeable.

The third phase cannot, therefore, be easily dated. But it can be seen developing through a number of studies in the 1990s, some already mentioned, in parallel with the second phase but subordinate to it during the 1990s.

The diverse nature of third-phase New Philology studies also make the phase difficult to delineate; which works are in or out of the school is even more debatable than with the first two phases. For analytical purposes, therefore, I shall discuss this literature in the context of three ways in which the third phase of the school is strengthening and broadening the New Philology's contribution to the fields to which it is related. This discussion shall take the form of suggestions for future directions as much as a summary of existing scholarship.

The first of these three ways is the interaction with disciplines beyond history and ethnohistorical anthropology. The New Philology was right from the onset interdisciplinary, but the third phase represents a far greater development of that aspect of the school. Perhaps the most obvious relevant discipline is that of linguistics, specifically linguistic anthropology. The foundational collaboration of Lockhart and Karttunen symbolically and fruitfully represented a meeting of history and linguistics, with Lockhart going on to work more on the history side of that interaction (e.g., 1992) and Karttunen more on the linguistic side (e.g., 1983). Like Bricker, Karttunen also anticipated the second phase's move into the Maya area with 1985's *Nahuatl and Maya in Contact with Spanish.* On the heels of this inadequately cited study, the scholarship of William Hanks on colonial Yucatec showed in more detail the potential for a linguist's methods to illuminate colonial Maya culture; this work was published in a series of important articles in the late-1980s (e.g., 1986; 1987), the substance of which was worked creatively into 1996's *Language and Communicative Practices* (while the articles themselves were reprinted in 1999's *Intertexts*).

The unabated attraction of the colonial Maya area for anthropologists, both those moving "up" from pre-Conquest times into the colonial period (e.g., Bricker and Hill) and those moving "back" from the modern period into the colonial one (e.g., Hanks), means that linguistic anthropology will continue to play an important role in New Philology's evolution in southern Mesoamerica. Worth mentioning here is the parallel development of Maya epigraphy, whose explosion as a field during the very same decades as the New Philology has relied on the collaboration of linguistic anthropologists with archaeologists, ethnohistorians, and art historians; one might almost talk of a "New

https://doi.org/10.1353/lar.2003.0012 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Epigraphy" that likewise emphasizes the analysis of native-language sources (in this case, glyphically written) to study native societies.

The topic of glyphs prompts discussion of one other discipline that has contributed to the New Philology's evolution—art history. The visual component of early colonial Mesoamerican texts—whether in the form of mural painting, illustrations in codices with or without alphabetic glosses, or maps—has long drawn art historians to colonial Mesoamerica. Such interest has traditionally been directed towards studying pre-colonial culture, an orientation that persists. However, art historians are increasingly concerned with sixteenth-century materials for what they reveal of early colonial native society. Studies that come to mind are Jeanette Peterson's, originally a UCLA dissertation published as 1993's *The Paradise Garden Murals of Malinalco,* Barbara Mundy's on *The Mapping of New Spain* (1996), and Constance Cortez's unpublished 1995 UCLA dissertation on the Xiu Family Tree from sixteenth-century Yucatan. Although these studies work from images rather than native-language alphabetic text (and thus are not included in the bibliography below), they are loosely affiliated to the New Philology in their emphasis on the empirical utility of such images to the study of colonial Mesoamerican cultures.

Furthermore, another UCLA dissertation in art history, Dana Leibsohn's "Historia Tolteca-Chichimeca" of 1993, shows that conventional New Philology methods—the translation and analysis of colonial Nahuatl documents—can be married with art historical methods in a highly productive manner. This point is also made in a study that comes from the direction of history, rather than art history; Terraciano's above-mentioned work on Ñudzahui culture and society uses both early colonial codices and alphabetically written Mixtec texts. Also in this category is the Berdan and Anawalt edition of the Codex Mendoza, likewise mentioned above, which has feet in phases one and three by virtue both of its scholarship and its release date (1992).

The second way in which the third phase of the school is strengthening and broadening the New Philology—and could do more so in the future—lies in the relationships between native-language and Spanish sources, and between ethnohistory (that is, the study of Mesoamericans and other native peoples) and other history (the study of non-natives). Several interrelated points are relevant here.

Native-language sources do not render Spanish-language sources redundant; the significance of the former does not negate the significance of the latter. Indeed, New Philologists have never asserted this to be the case (even though, as critics of the school observed, this has certainly *seemed* to be the position of many New Philologists). The field's subalternists implied in foundational manifestos that their approach is a permanent, preferable alternative to other ways of studying Latin

https://doi.org/10.1353/lar.2003.0012 Published online by Cambridge University Press

American history (e.g., Mallon 1994; Latin American Subaltern Studies Group 1995). The New Philology may be said to hold such a position in regard to its philological *method,* but with respect to its *model* (studying natives and native sources exclusively), the school has arguably claimed only to be a stage of study; the assumption has always been that while native-language sources offer unique insights, the long-term goal is to use complementary sources in all available languages in order to gain as full an understanding as possible.

In this sense Horn's 1997 monograph and Terraciano's of 2001 are both third-phase studies; although the former is based on a first-phase *nahuatlato* dissertation, and the latter is a second-phase dissertation using Mixtec sources, both also make extensive use of Spanish-language sources. Poole's 1995 monograph on the Virgin of Guadalupe—which in classic New Philology fashion anticipated his collaborative publication of the key Nahuatl text (Sousa, Poole, and Lockhart 1998)—was equally concerned with Nahuatl and Spanish sources.

Two graduate students currently working under my supervision at the Pennsylvania State University, Edward Osowski and Jason Frederick, have both been using a combination of Spanish and native-language sources in order to write about aspects of colonial Mesoamerican culture and colonial society (Osowski filed his dissertation in 2002). David Tavarez recently filed a dissertation at the University of Chicago that uses sources in Nahuatl and Zapotec, as well as Spanish and Latin, to examine the spiritual conquest from both extirpator and native perspectives. Recently phase-one veteran Schroeder (2000) published an article that expertly combined Nahuatl- and Spanish-source analysis (a more modest attempt to do the same with Maya and Spanish sources in Restall 2001).

These examples are but a small portion of this type of work currently being conducted. Even published New Philology studies that overwhelmingly use native-language sources, such as Lockhart's *The Nahuas* and my *The Maya World,* do so in large part because lengthy studies of the same societies using Spanish sources had already been published (those by Gibson and Farriss, respectively), permitting a complementarity and dialogue with those earlier works.

In fact, no reason exists as to why the school's specific philological methods must be restricted to native-language sources. The school's principles relating to the detailed study of language and its use, and to the privileging of empiricism and deduction over theory and political posturing, can just as easily be applied to Spanish-language sources. The New Philological principle that one must have a grasp on linguistics, not just on dictionary navigation, and thus engage a language as much grammatically as lexically, can likewise be applied to Spanish as much as to Mesoamerican tongues (even if many New Philologists have not always adhered strictly to the principle). This kind of analysis has to

https://doi.org/10.1353/lar.2003.0012 Published online by Cambridge University Press

some extent already been underway for years, both in preliminary form in the work cited in the previous paragraph, and in the form of textual analysis mostly by scholars from literature departments. The latter differs significantly, however, from how New Philologists might approach Spanish texts in the theoretical premises of literary criticism and—in recent years—its postmodern suspicion of text itself.

Arguably, the use of native-language sources is so fundamental to the New Philology that the notion of the school's spread to the study of sources in other languages is contradictory and absurd. This may be so. However, the fact remains that most native groups of colonial Latin America either did not write at all in their own languages or they left behind very few such records indeed. Colonial Andeanists in particular have responded to the absence of such sources with an increasingly sophisticated set of methodologies; as the New Philology has developed in recent decades, Andeanists have produced an impressive body of scholarship from which colonial Mesoamericanists can learn a great deal. Yet the two sub-fields remain distinct, largely because of the impact of the New Philology in Mesoamerican studies; even projects intended to highlight common ground, such as the 1998 *Dead Giveaways* volume edited by Kellogg and myself, tend to highlight differences as much as similarities in method and approach. Nevertheless, some important work has been done with Quechua that is in many ways New Philological, perhaps most notably in two 1991 Texas publications, one by Bruce Mannheim, the other by Frank Salomon and George Urioste. Although there has yet to coalesce an Andeanist movement comparable to that of Mesoamerica's New Philology, the potential for such a development is surely present—based partly on the fact that Quechua-language sources are now slowly emerging (as Salomon 1999, 26–51 and Lockhart 2000, 218–27 tantalizingly reveal) and partly on the foundation built by Salomon and others with their integration of Spanish and Quechua sources into a single framework of analysis. Thus the most significant impact of this potential spread of the school out of native languages would be the fostering of new dialogues between Mesoamericanists and Andeanists.

Therefore, there is no reason why the New Philology must remain a school within ethnohistory; if it can embrace Spanish-language sources, it can also embrace Spaniards, and indeed all peoples of European and African descent in colonial Latin America. This suggestion may have the potential to be as absurd as the last, if taken to extremes (i.e., the New Philology as the use of everything to study everyone), but it also contains an undeniable logic. If our purpose is to gain a fuller understanding of native societies using a broader application of New Philology methods to a wider range of sources, then why not extend that ambition to include a fuller understanding of colonial society as a whole?

https://doi.org/10.1353/lar.2003.0012 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In other words, the balance between the school's model and method would shift, with the model (emphasizing native sources and societies) modified or abandoned as the method (philological analysis of primary sources) became applied to non-native sources and societies. This idea has already been put into practice in limited contexts (a good example is Horn's *Postconquest Coyoacan*); the complete and large-scale application of this holism has yet to be attempted.

The third way in which the school's third phase is strengthening it—but, again, could do so much more in this regard—is in the relationship between theory and the New Philology. I have already mentioned a number of approaches and schools distinct from the New Philology, some of them very much theory-based, and I have cited some New Philological studies that attempt to build bridges between the school and otherwise unrelated theoretical models; an example is Sigal's recent monograph on colonial Maya sexuality. The initial broad point here, therefore, is that the New Philology can only benefit from such attempts to cross boundaries and build methodological bridges. For example, the current attention being given in North America to the new cultural history in Latin American studies may lead to further dialogue between it and the New Philology, and as a general principle, I would welcome such a development—as I would attempt to link the school to any other type of history or body of theory. Still pertinent are the remarks made almost thirty years ago by Lockhart, quoted at the top of this essay, and by Karen Spalding, that the "continued interplay between careful attention and sensitivity to the wealth of detail in our sources and increasingly refined hypotheses and models enriched by that detail promises to augment considerably" our understanding of the past (1972, 67).

However, there is a more specific point I would like to make here which rather contradicts that welcoming generalization, at least with respect to the new cultural history (not New Cultural History; in response to Claudio Lomnitz [1999, 367], there is indeed no school of that name in Latin Americanist history, but there is surely an approach common to a significant variety of publications). One of the strengths of the New Philology has always been, in my view, the relative lack of the "overly long methodological and theoretical prolegomena" and "navel-gazing" (Van Young 1999, 215) that some have argued characterizes the new cultural history. While the New Philology is still relatively new and is certainly cultural history, it is clearly distinct from the new cultural history through its insistence upon empiricism and the authority of the sources, and in its refusal to kowtow to authorities from other fields or to attempt to apply theoretical paradigms developed in historical and cultural contexts very different to those of colonial Mesoamerica. The New Philology is not "political and performative" in its goals as Stephen Haber (1999, 330) has persuasively, if pointedly, argued is true of the new cultural history.

https://doi.org/10.1353/lar.2003.0012 Published online by Cambridge University Press

On the other hand, the New Philology is usually viewed as associated in some way with the new cultural history. This is because the field of Latin American history has tended to be viewed as divided into two camps. Even though every practitioner in the field has a slightly different notion of how those camps are defined, and even though the New Philology is hardly unique in its vision of social history as inclusive of economic and political matters (rendering the very term "social history" redundant), any kind of social or cultural history is usually viewed as being in opposition to any kind of economic (and often political) history. The latest, predominant vision of this division was articulated in a collection of essays in May 1999's *Hispanic American Historical Review*, in which Eric Van Young (1999, 234) effectively claimed the New Philology (albeit not named as such) as part of the colonial period's new cultural history (the other contributors focused on the modern period and thus did not discuss the New Philology, although Susan Socolow mentions Lockhart; 1999, 357). Certainly few readers of Haber's description of social science history and his critique of the new cultural history would imagine that the New Philology had much at all to do with the former and its "formalized thought" and "quantitative analysis" (1999, 310).

I would like to suggest, however, that the New Philology contains (or at least has the potential to contain) the best of both worlds—or all three worlds, to follow Haber's categories of social science history (quotes below from 1999, 310), traditional history (quotes below from 1999, 310–11), and new cultural history. Like social science history, the New Philology "stresses logical consistency" (e.g., in the use of language and the cultural import of that usage), it "frames hypotheses" drawn from one genre and tests them using another (e.g., records of political disputes and corpora of election records), and it analyzes "systematically gathered data" (e.g., loanword analysis and the tabulation of material wealth using testaments). Like traditional history, the New Philology also tends to construct "authoritative narrative[s]" using "eyewitness evidence, in the legal sense," corroborated by "similar accounts," with the assistance of "reasoning by analogy" and a certain amount of "historical imagination" (all of which are highly relevant to the reading of the mundane, notarial documents that are the bread and butter of the New Philology).

Like the new cultural history (quotes below from Van Young 1999, 218), the New Philology has traditionally been interested "in subordinate groups" (i.e., colonial Mesoamericans; e.g., considerable attention paid to native women), and is concerned with "the study of mentalities" and its associated "symbolic systems" (e.g., the New Philology's treatment of the spiritual conquest and colonial Mesoamerican religious cultures). (With respect to two other characteristics of the new cultural history suggested by Van Young, the New Philology is, in my view,

https://doi.org/10.1353/lar.2003.0012 Published online by Cambridge University Press

deductivist rather than inductivist; and it is cautious and sensitive in its approach to sources, rather than "highly critical.")

Picking and choosing characteristics from different (and controversially defined) historical approaches in this way is, I realize, a rather facile and contrived way of promoting the ecumenical virtues of the New Philology. But the point should be clear; that the school contains elements of these approaches but defies close association with any of them; it is, if you like, new traditional history, or culture history without the "new," or social science with more social than science. As such, it has the potential—and should pursue the opportunity—to bridge far more than divide.

My characterization of the New Philology as both representing the best of all types of history and exploding into neighboring disciplines may seem imperialist and self-serving. After all, there is much that the school has not done, and there is a fair amount that it has done badly. Van Young's remark that "there is an inclination" in the school "to feel that the work is done when the philology is done" (1999, 24) is an entirely valid criticism. Edited volumes of sources should not become a substitute for monographs; microregional studies must be placed in larger contexts; taking empiricism as one's theoretical foundation does not mean other theories can be ignored.

But I would suggest that the New Philology's expansion is less an imperialist assault on other sub-fields and disciplines than an attempt to address its own weaknesses and to borrow from other approaches as much as to influence them. The future significance of the New Philology is its increasing lack of a distinct identity; its lasting influence and impact are increasingly indicated by its incorporation into the broader development of the fields of colonial Mexican, Mesoamerican, and possibly even Latin American scholarship. In a manner of speaking, therefore, in the future, every student of colonial Mexico and of colonial ethnohistory, and many who work in adjacent fields, will be a New Philologist. The true test of the New Philology's value will be its invisibility.

REFERENCES I: A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE NEW PHILOLOGY

This bibliography includes all major, relevant publications in English from 1976 to the present cited in the article above; it excludes Spanish-language items, most articles, and pre-1976 "roots" items; dissertations are only listed if they remain unpublished.

ANDERSON, ARTHUR, AND CHARLES E. DIBBLE
1955–82 *The Florentine Codex.* 12 vols. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.
ANDERSON, ARTHUR, FRANCES BERDAN, AND JAMES LOCKHART
1976 *Beyond the Codices.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

https://doi.org/10.1353/lar.2003.0012 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ANDERSON, ARTHUR, AND SUSAN SCHROEDER, EDS.
1997 *Codex Chimalpahin.* Vols. 1 and 2. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

ANDREWS, J. RICHARD, AND ROSS HASSIG, EDS.
1984 *Treatise on the Heathen Superstitions That Today Live Among the Indians Native to This New Spain, by Hernando Ruiz de Alarcón.* Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

BERDAN, FRANCES, AND PATRICIA RIEFF ANAWALT, EDS.
1992 *The Codex Mendoza.* 4 vols. Berkeley: University of California Press.

BIERHORST, JOHN
1985a *Cantares Mexicanos: Songs of the Aztecs.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.
1985b *A Nahuatl-English Dictionary and Concordance to the Cantares Mexicanos.* 2 vols. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
1992a *History and Mythology of the Aztecs: The Codex Chimalpopoca.* Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
1992b *Codex Chimalpopoca: The Text in Nahuatl with a Glossary and Grammatical Notes.* Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

BRICKER, VICTORIA
1981 *The Indian Christ, the Indian King: The Historical Substrate of Maya Myth and Ritual.* Austin: University of Texas Press.

BURKHART, LOUISE
1989 *The Slippery Earth: Nahua-Christian Moral Dialogue in Sixteenth-Century Mexico.* Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
1995 "The Voyage of Saint Amaro: A Spanish Legend in Nahuatl Literature." *Colonial Latin American Review* 4:29–57.
1996a *Holy Wednesday: A Nahua Drama from Early Colonial Mexico.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
1996b "Indigenous Literature in Preconquest and Colonial Mesoamerica." In *The Legacy of Mesoamerica: History and Culture of a Native American Civilization,* edited by Robert Carmack, Janine Gasco, and Gary Gossen, 407–41. Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
2001 *Before Guadalupe: The Virgin Mary in Early Colonial Nahuatl Literature.* Monograph 13. Albany: SUNY Institute for Mesoamerican Studies.

CLINE, S.L.
1986 *Colonial Culhuacan, 1580–1600: A Social History of an Aztec Town.* Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

CLINE, S.L., ED.
1993 *The Book of Tributes: Early Sixteenth-Century Nahuatl Censuses from Morelos.* Los Angeles: UCLA Latin American Center Publications.

CLINE, S. L., AND MIGUEL LEÓN-PORTILLA, EDS.
1984 *The Testaments of Culhuacan.* Los Angeles: UCLA Latin American Center Publications.

EDMONSON, MUNRO S.
1982 *The Ancient Future of the Itza: The Book of Chilam Balam of Tizimin.* Austin: University of Texas Press.
1986 *Heaven Born Merida and Its Destiny: The Book of Chilam Balam of Chumayel.* Austin: University of Texas Press.

GRUZINKSI, SERGE
1993 *The Conquest of Mexico: The Incorporation of Indian Societies into the Western World, 16th-18th Centuries.* Cambridge, England: Polity Press.

HANKS, WILLIAM F.
1986 "Authenticity and Ambivalence in the Text: A Colonial Maya Case." *American Ethnologist* 13, no. 4: 721–44.
1987 "Discourse Genres in a Theory of Practice." In *American Ethnologist* 14, no. 4: 668–92.
1996 *Language and Communicative Practices.* Boulder: Westview Press.
1999 *Intertexts.* Lanham, Md.: Rowman and Littlefield.

HASKETT, ROBERT S.
1991 *Indigenous Rulers: An Ethnohistory of Town Government in Colonial Cuernavaca.* Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

https://doi.org/10.1353/lar.2003.0012 Published online by Cambridge University Press

HILL, ROBERT M., II

1992 *Colonial Cakchiquels: Highland Maya Adaptation to Spanish Rule, 1600–1700.* Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace.

HORN, REBECCA

1997 *Postconquest Coyoacan: Nahua-Spanish Relations in Central Mexico, 1519–1650.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

KARTTUNEN, FRANCES

1982 "Nahuatl Literacy." In *The Inca and Aztec States, 1400–1800,* edited by George Collier et al, 395–417. New York: Academic Press.

1983 *An Analytical Dictionary of Nahuatl.* Austin: University of Texas Press.

1985 *Nahuatl and Maya in Contact with Spanish.* Texas Linguistic Forum 26. Austin: University of Texas Department of Linguistics.

KARTTUNEN, FRANCES, AND JAMES LOCKHART

1976 *Nahuatl in the Middle Years: Language Contact Phenomena in Texts of the Colonial Period.* University of California Publications in Linguistics 85. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

1987 *The Art of Nahuatl Speech: The Bancroft Dialogues.* Los Angeles: UCLA Latin American Center Publications.

KELLOGG, SUSAN M.

1995 *Law and the Transformation of Aztec Culture, 1500–1700.* Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

KELLOGG, SUSAN, AND MATTHEW RESTALL, EDS.

1998 *Dead Giveaways: Indigenous Testaments of Colonial Mesoamerica and the Andes.* Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.

LEIBSOHN, DANA

1993 "The Historia Tolteca-Chichimeca: Recollecting Identity in a Nahua Manuscript." Ph.D. diss., University of California, Los Angeles.

LOCKHART, JAMES

1991a *Nahuas and Spaniards: Postconquest Central Mexican History and Philology.* Stanford and Los Angeles: Stanford University Press and UCLA Latin American Center Publications.

1992 *The Nahuas After the Conquest: A Social and Cultural History of the Indians of Central Mexico, Sixteenth Through Eighteenth Centuries.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

1993 *We People Here: Nahuatl Accounts of the Conquest of Mexico.* Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

2000 *Of Things of the Indies: Essays Old and New in Early Latin American History.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

2001 *Nahuatl as Written: Lessons in Older Written Nahuatl, with Copious Examples and Texts.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

2001b *Grammar of the Mexican Language, with an explanation of its adverbs (1645), by Horacio Carochi,* S. J. Stanford and Los Angeles: Stanford University Press and UCLA Latin American Center Publications.

LOCKHART, JAMES, FRANCES BERDAN, AND ARTHUR ANDERSON

1986 *The Tlaxcalan Actas: A Compendium of the Records of the Cabildo of Tlaxcala (1545–1627).* Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.

MANNHEIM, BRUCE

1991 *The Language of the Inka Since the European Invasion.* Austin: University of Texas Press.

MAXWELL, JUDITH M., AND CRAIG A. HANSON

1993 *Of the Manners of Speaking That the Old Ones Had: The Metaphors of Andrés de Olmos in the TULAL Manuscript.* Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.

OFFUTT, LESLIE

1992 "Levels of Acculturation as Suggested by San Esteban Testaments: A Comparison of Wills from the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries." *Estudios de Cultura Náhuatl* 22:409–43.

OSOWSKI, EDWARD

2002 "Saints of the Republic: Nahua Religious Obligations in Central Mexico, 1692–

https://doi.org/10.1353/lar.2003.0012 Published online by Cambridge University Press

1810." Ph.D. diss., Pennsylvania State University.

POOLE, STAFFORD

1995 *Our Lady of Guadalupe: The Origins and Sources of a Mexican National Symbol, 1531–1797.* Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

RESTALL, MATTHEW

1995 *Life and Death in a Maya Community: The Ixil Testaments of the 1760s.* Lancaster, Calif.: Labyrinthos.

1997a *The Maya World: Yucatec Culture and Society, 1550–1850.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

1997b "Heirs to the Hieroglyphs: Indigenous Literacy in Colonial Mesoamerica." *The Americas* 54, no. 2: 239–67.

1998 *Maya Conquistador.* Boston: Beacon Press.

2001 "The People of the Patio: Ethnohistorical Evidence of Yucatec Maya Royal Courts." In *Royal Courts of the Ancient Maya.* Vol. 2. edited by Takeshi Inomata and Stephen Houston, 335–90. Boulder: Westview Press.

SALOMON, FRANK, AND GEORGE L. URIOSTE

1991 *The Huarochirí Manuscript: A Testament of Ancient and Colonial Andean Religion.* Austin: University of Texas Press.

SCHROEDER, SUSAN

1991 *Chimalpahin and the Kingdoms of Chalco.* Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

2000 "Jesuits, Nahuas, and the Good Death Society in Mexico City, 1710–1767." *Hispanic American Historical Review* 80, no. 1 (February): 43–76.

SCHROEDER, SUSAN, STEPHANIE WOOD, AND ROBERT HASKETT, EDS.

1997 *Indian Women of Early Mexico.* Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

SELL, BARRY D.

1994 "Friars, Nahuas, and Books: Language and Expression in Colonial Nahuatl Publications." Ph.D. diss., University of California, Los Angeles.

SIGAL, PETE

2000 *From Moon Goddesses to Virgins: The Colonization of Yucatecan Maya Sexual Desire.* Austin: University of Texas Press.

SOUSA, LISA, ED.

1992 *Indigenous Writing in the Spanish Indies.* Vol. 12. UCLA Historical Journal Special Issue. Los Angeles.

SOUSA, LISA

1998 "Women in Native Societies and Cultures of Colonial Mexico." Ph.D. diss., University of California, Los Angeles.

SOUSA, LISA, STAFFORD POOLE, AND JAMES LOCKHART

1998 *The Story of Guadalupe: Luis Laso de la Vega's Hueitlamahuiçoltica of 1649.* Stanford and Los Angeles: Stanford University Press and UCLA Latin American Center Publications.

TAVAREZ, DAVID

2000 "Invisible Wars: Idolatry Extirpation Projects and Native Responses in Nahua and Zapotec Communities, 1536–1728." Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago.

TEDLOCK, DENNIS

1985 *Popol Vuh: The Definitive Edition of the Mayan Book of the Dawn of Life*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

TERRACIANO, KEVIN

2000 "The Colonial Mixtec Community." *Hispanic American Historical Review* 80, no. 1 (February): 1–42.

2001 *The Mixtecs of Colonial Oaxaca: Ñudzahui History, Sixteenth Through Eighteenth Centuries.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

THOMPSON, PHILIP C.

1999 *Tekanto, a Maya Town in Colonial Yucatán.* Pub. 67. New Orleans: Tulane University's Middle American Research Institute.

WOOD, STEPHANIE

1984 "Corporate Adjustments in Colonial Mexican Indian Towns: Toluca Region." Ph.D. diss., University of California, Los Angeles.

https://doi.org/10.1353/lar.2003.0012 Published online by Cambridge University Press

REFERENCES II: HISTORIOGRAPHICAL ESSAYS

This bibliography lists essays cited above. Also see the discussion of New Philology publications in a broader historiographical context in the bibliographical essays included within articles by Sarah Cline (on the Nahuas), Grant D. Jones (on the Yucatec Mayas), and W. George Lovell (on the Guatemalan Mayas) in *The Cambridge History of the Native Peoples of the Americas: Volume II, Mesoamerica, Part 2* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

EDMONSON, MUNRO, AND VICTORIA R. BRICKER

1985 "Yucatecan Mayan Literature." In *Supplement to the Handbook of Middle American Indians.* Vol. 3, *Literatures,* edited by Munro Edmonson and Victoria R. Bricker, 44–63. Austin: University of Texas Press.

HABER, STEPHEN

1999 "Anything Goes: Mexico's 'New' Cultural History." *HAHR* 79, no. 2 (May): 309–30.

KICZA, JOHN E.

1995 "Recent Books on Ethnohistory and Ethnic Relations in Colonial Mexico." *Latin American Research Review* 30, no. 3: 239–53.

LATIN AMERICAN SUBALTERN STUDIES GROUP

1995 "Founding Statement." In *The Postmodernism Debate in Latin America,* edited by John Beverly, Michael Aronna, and José Oviedo. Durham: Duke University Press.

LOCKHART, JAMES

1972 "The Social History of Colonial Spanish America: Evolution and Potential." *Latin American Research Review* 7, no. 1: 6–45. [Revised extensively as Lockhart 2000: 27–80.]

1991b "A Vein of Ethnohistory." In *Nahuas and Spaniards. Postconquest Central Mexican History and Philology,* by James Lockhart, 182–200. Stanford and Los Angeles: Stanford University Press and UCLA Latin American Center Publications.

LOMNITZ, CLAUDIO

1999 "Barbarians at the Gate?: A Few Remarks on the Politics of the 'New Cultural History of Mexico'." *Hispanic American Historical Review* 79, no. 2 (May): 367–83.

MALLON, FLORENCIA E.

1994 "The Promise and Dilemma of Subaltern Studies: Perspectives from Latin American History." *American Historical Review* 99, no. 5: 1491–1515.

RADDING, CYNTHIA

1998 "Cultural Dialogues: Recent Trends in Mesoamerican Ethnohistory." *Latin American Research Review* 33, no. 1: 193–211.

SALOMON, FRANK

1999 "Testimonies: The Making and Reading of Native South American Historical Sources." In *Cambridge History of the Native Peoples of the Americas, Volume III: South America, Part 2,* edited by Frank Salomon and Stuart Schwartz, 19–95. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

SOCOLOW, SUSAN

1999 "Putting the 'Cult' in Culture." *Hispanic American Historical Review* 79, no. 2 (May): 355–65.

SPALDING, KAREN

1972 "The Colonial Indian: Past and Future Research Perspectives." *Latin American Research Review* 7, no. 1: 47–76.

VAN YOUNG, ERIC

1999 "The New Cultural History Comes to Old Mexico." *Hispanic American Historical Review* 79, no. 2 (May): 211–47.

https://doi.org/10.1353/lar.2003.0012 Published online by Cambridge University Press